arXiv:1510.04383v1 [math.AG] 15 Oct 2015

ON ENDOMORPHISMS OF HYPERSURFACES

ILYA KARZHEMANOV

Abstract. For any prime $p \geq 5$, we show that generic hypersurface $X_p \subset \mathbb{P}^p$ defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ admits a non-trivial rational dominant self-map of degree > 1, defined over $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$. A simple arithmetic application of this fact is also given.

1. Introduction

1.1. Let X be an algebraic variety (smooth, projective, over a field of characteristic 0). Then two groups of symmetries of X, namely $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ (biregular automorphisms) and $\mathrm{Bir}(X)$ (birational ones), come for free. The question on whether these groups differ is classical and very important. For instance, the property $\mathrm{Aut}(X) = \mathrm{Bir}(X)$, signifying *birational (super)rigidity* of X, is an obstruction for X to be rational (these X have been studied in numerous papers such as [18], [26], [11], [19], [7], [20]).

In this respect, it is natural to consider another (more general) class of symmetries of X, namely $\mathrm{End}(X)$, consisting of *rational dominant* endomorphisms of X. Then one may ask (what seems to be a folklore) whether $\mathrm{End}(X) = \mathrm{Bir}(X)$? (Notice that the latter property is an obstruction for X to be unirational.) This question gets immediate answer ('yes') in the case when X (with $\mathrm{Pic}(X) = \mathbb{Z}$ at least) is of general type (for all endomorphisms preserve the spaces $H^0(X, mK_X)$ for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}$). On the other hand, already in the Calabi-Yau case the things are not that straightforward; but still one gets $\mathrm{End}(X) = \mathrm{Bir}(X)$ when X is a general K3 surface for example (see [9]).

Presently, we would like to treat rationally connected X, namely that $X := X_N \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ being a hypersurface of degree N (see [26], [17], [6], [8] for some other aspects of the geometry of these X_N). Recall that according to [12] every $X_N, N \geq 4$, is non-rational, having $\mathrm{Bir}(X_N) = \mathrm{Aut}(X_N)$.

Our main result is

Theorem 1.2. *For any prime $p \geq 5$, (Zariski) generic $\mathbb{Q}$-hypersurface $X_p \subset \mathbb{P}^p$ admits an endomorphism f_{X_p} of degree > 1, defined over $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$. More precisely, f_{X_p} has the field of definition – $\mathbf{k}$ below, – same for all X_p.*

Thus the "non-regular" geometry of $X = X_p$ is pretty much fruitful (compare with results from [2], [4], [25] accounting to *regular* self-maps of X). At the same time, the proof of Theorem 1.2 is not effective, and it would be interesting to describe (a part of) $\mathrm{End}(X)$ explicitly. For example, what is the $\mathrm{End}(X)$-action on the universal Chow group of X (cf. [27], [3])? It is also plausible to get rid of the degree/ground field/dimension assumption in the formulation of our result. Say, can one take *any* Fano manifold X in place of X_p, or at least any (composite) integer N instead of p?

1.3. In order to prove Theorem 1.2 we first relate X_p to those hypersurfaces that have lots of endomorphisms. The latter are $X_d \subset \mathbb{P}^N$, defined over a given field, that happen to be unirational over this field, provided that $N \gg d$ is sufficiently large (see **2.1** below for the precise statements).

Next we employ the *degree formula* from [28] (cf. [24], [21], [16]). Recall that this formula is a byproduct of the relation between the connective K-theory classes of two algebraic varieties X and Y admitting some rational map $f : X \dashrightarrow Y$. However, in order to get something fruitful on this way (e. g. to show that f with $\deg f = 0$ does not exist) one has to consider X, Y, etc. to be defined over algebraically non-closed field $\mathbf{k}$, and (roughly speaking) to have no points over $\mathbf{k}$. This is probably the reason for the degree (resp. dimension or the ground field) restriction in Theorem 1.2.

Remark 1.4. One of the basic obstructions for applying our method to arbitrary (Fano) hypersurfaces $X_d \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ is that these usually have points over the field of definition (cf. [5]). There may also be no such nice congruence relation as in Corollary 2.5 below. But still, once we find (sufficiently many?) endomorphisms of $X_p \subset \mathbb{P}^p$ which preserve some projective subspace $\Gamma \subset X_p$, one may hope (by projecting from Γ) to obtain non-trivial endomorphisms of X_d for some (all?) $d \leq p - 1$.

The principal part of our arguments relies on (a part of) the main result in [10] which asserts the existence of $X = X_p = Y$ as indicated above. It is then not hard to derive Theorem 1.2 for the given X_p and the general case follows easily (see

Section 3 for details). Again we indicate that the initial X_p is very special. (It is defined over a field $\mathbf{k}$ of cohomological dimension ≤ 1 and does not contain points over the extensions of $\mathbf{k}$ whose degrees are coprime with p.)

1.5. The next result was motivated by the paper [1]:

Corollary 1.6. *For $X_p \subset \mathbb{P}^p$ as in Theorem 1.2, there exists a possibly larger number field $K \supseteq \mathbb{Q}$ and a rational dominant map $f : X_p \dashrightarrow X_p$ such that Zariski closure of the f-orbit of the set $X_p(K)$ of K-rational points on X_p has dimension ≥ 2.*

One may consider Corollary 1.6 as a generalization of [15, Theorem 1.4]. Yet, unfortunately, our conclusion is weaker and it would be interesting to establish potential density of the set $X_p(\mathbb{Q})$ in X_p (e. g. by refining the arguments in Section 4 below).

Acknowledgments. I am grateful to F. Bogomolov and K. Zainoulline for their interest and fruitful conversations. The results of this paper have been discussed with K. Oguiso, S. Okawa, and B. Poonen during my visits to Osaka University and MIT, respectively, in Spring 2015. I am grateful to these people for hospitality. The work was supported by World Premier International Research Initiative (WPI), MEXT, Japan, and Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (26887009) from Japan Mathematical Society (Kakenhi).

2. Preliminaries

2.1. Fix some integers d and r. Recall that any smooth hypersurface $X_d \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ contains a projective subspace $\Lambda \simeq \mathbb{P}^r$ when $N \gg 1$ (see [14], [22]). More precisely, X_d corresponds to a generic point in the incidence subvariety

$$Z := \{(X_d, \Lambda) \mid \Lambda \subset X_d\} \subset \mathbb{P}^{\binom{N+d}{d}} \times \mathrm{Gr}(r+1, N+1),$$

with *dominant* projections $Z \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}$, Gr.

Further, if Λ is given over an arbitrary field $\mathbf{k}_0 \subset \mathbb{C}$ by equations $l_{N-r+1} = \ldots = l_N = 0$ for some linear forms l_i, then X_d can be chosen to be defined over $\mathbf{k} := \mathbf{k}_0(\sqrt{-1})$. Indeed, any X_d passing through Λ has the defining equation $\sum_{i=N-r+1}^{N} \phi_i l_i = 0$, for some (varying) forms ϕ_i of degree $d-1$. Then, since the set of $\mathbf{k}$-points is obviously dense in $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{N+d-1}{d-1}}$ (w. r. t. the complex analytic

topology), one can approximate ϕ_i by such $\mathbf{k}$-forms of degree $d-1$ that X_d remains smooth.

Thus, as one can always find generic $\Lambda \in \mathrm{Gr}(r, N)$ to be defined over $\mathbf{k}$ the above discussion provides a smooth hypersurface X_d and a projective subspace $\Lambda \subset X_d$, both over $\mathbf{k}$, for any given d, r and sufficiently large $N = N(d, r)$. From [14, Corollary 3.7] we obtain

Theorem 2.2 (Harris, Mazur, Pandharipande)**.** *X_d is $\mathbf{k}$-unirational.*

2.3. Let X, Y be smooth projective geometrically irreducible $\mathbf{k}_0$-varieties of dimension $d = \dim X = \dim Y$. Assume that there is a rational $\mathbf{k}_0$-map $f : X \dashrightarrow Y$. The degree $\deg f$ equals 0 if f is non-dominant; otherwise $\deg f := [\mathbf{k}_0(X) : f^*\mathbf{k}_0(Y)]$.

We recall the next result from [28]:

Theorem 2.4 (Zainoulline)**.** $\chi(\mathcal{O}_X) \cdot \tau_{d-1} \equiv \deg f \cdot \chi(\mathcal{O}_Y) \cdot \tau_{d-1} \mod n_Y$*, where* $\chi(\cdot)$ *is the Euler characteristic,*

$$\tau_{d-1} := \prod_{p \text{ prime}} p^{\left[\frac{d-1}{p-1}\right]}$$

is the $(d-1)$-st Todd number, and n_Y is the g. c. d. of degrees of all closed points on Y.

An immediate consequence of Theorem 2.4 is

Corollary 2.5 (cf. [28, Example 6.4])**.** *In the previous notations, if $n_X = p$, $X = Y = X_p \subset \mathbb{P}^p$ (i. e. $d = p-1$) for some prime $p \geq 3$, and (more generally) f is a $\mathbf{k}$-map, then* $\deg f > 0$*. (Such X is called* incompressible *over $\mathbf{k}$.)*

Proof. Regard X as a hypersurface over $\mathbf{k}$. Then, since $[\mathbf{k} : \mathbf{k}_0] \leq 2$, we get $n_X = p$ again. The claim now follows from Theorem 2.4 (with $\mathbf{k}_0$ replaced by $\mathbf{k}$) and the fact that $\chi(\mathcal{O}_X) = 1 = (\tau_{p-2}, p)$. □

The existence of $X = X_p$ as in Corollary 2.5 is guaranteed by the following result (see [10, Theorem 8]):

Proposition 2.6 (Colliot-Thélène)**.** *For any prime $p \geq 5$, there is a smooth (over $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$) hypersurface $X \subset \mathbb{P}^p$, given (over $\mathbb{Q}$) by the equation*

$$x_1^p + lx_2^p + \ldots + l^{p-1}x_p^p - \alpha x_0^p = 0$$

for some integers l, α, so that $n_X = p$.

Remark 2.7. Let t be a transcendental parameter and $X_p \subset \mathbb{P}^p$ some $\mathbb{Q}(t)$-hypersurface. It follows from Proposition 2.6 (by specializing $t \mapsto 0$) that generic such X_p also satisfies $n_{X_p} = p$. (Here "generic" means a point from Zariski open subset of the $\mathbb{Q}(t)$-variety $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{2p}{p}}$ parameterizing all hypersurfaces of degree p in $\mathbb{P}^p$ defined over the field $\mathbb{Q}(t)$.)

3. Proof of Theorem 1.2

We keep on with notations of Section 2.

3.1. Let X be as in Proposition 2.6. Consider a cone $\hat{X} \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ over X of sufficiently large dimension and a family $\mathcal{X}$ of degree p hypersurfaces ($\subset \mathbb{P}^N$) over $\mathbb{Q}$ that smooths out the singularities of $\hat{X}$. We may regard (the general fiber of) $\mathcal{X}$ as a smooth $\mathbf{k}_0$-hypersurface of degree p in $\mathbb{P}^N$ for some purely transcendental field $\mathbf{k}_0 \supset \mathbb{Q}$.

Next, using the (dominant) projections $Z \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}$, Gr one can see by the same argument as in **2.1** that the set of all $\mathbf{k}$-points $(X_d, \Lambda) \in Z$ is dense on Z in the complex analytic topology, and so $\mathcal{X}$ can be approximated by $\mathbf{k}$-hypersurfaces X_d (for $\mathcal{X}, X_d$ treated as points on $\mathbb{P}$, with $\mathbf{k} \subset \mathbb{C}$).

Lemma 3.2. *In the previous setting, the hypersurface $\mathcal{X}$ contains a projective subspace $\subset \mathbb{P}^N$, isomorphic to Λ and defined over $\mathbf{k}$.*

Proof. It suffices to show there exists a $\mathbf{k}$-point on Z whose projection to $\mathbb{P}$ coincides with $\mathcal{X}$. For this observe that $\mathcal{X}$ and X_d can actually be put on an affine line $\mathbb{A}^1_{\mathbf{k}} \subset \mathbb{P}$. The preimage $\widetilde{\mathbb{A}^1_{\mathbf{k}}} \subset Z$ of $\mathbb{A}^1_{\mathbf{k}}$ has all fibers = some projective spaces and generic fiber isomorphic to Λ. Furthermore, the natural projection $\widetilde{\mathbb{A}^1_{\mathbf{k}}} \longrightarrow \mathbb{A}^1_{\mathbf{k}}$ is $\mathrm{Gal}(\bar{\mathbf{k}}/\mathbf{k})$-equivariant, hence its fiber over $\mathcal{X}$ is a projective $\mathbf{k}$-space. The claim now follows. □

Without loss of generality we will assume that $\mathbf{k}_0 = \mathbb{Q}(t)$.

Lemma 3.3. *There exists a $\mathbf{k}$-endomorphism $f : \mathcal{X} \dashrightarrow \mathcal{X}$ such that* $\deg f > 1$.

Proof. It follows from Lemma 3.2 and Theorem 2.2 (applied to $X_d := \mathcal{X}$) that $\mathcal{X}$ is $\mathbf{k}$-unirational. This yields two rational dominant $\mathbf{k}$-maps $\phi : \mathbb{P}^{N-1} \dashrightarrow \mathcal{X}$ and $\psi : \mathcal{X} \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^{N-1}$. We may assume one of ϕ, ψ to have degree > 1. Then it remains to take $f := \phi \circ \psi$. □

3.4. Let f be as in Lemma 3.3. Note that f is induced by a rational self-map of $\mathbb{P}^N \supset \mathcal{X}, \hat{X}$. Indeed, since $p \geq 5$ and thus $\mathrm{Pic}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathbb{Z}$ (Lefschetz), the map f is given by such a linear system on $\mathcal{X}$ that is obtained by restricting a linear system from $\mathbb{P}^N$.

Put f_0 be the specialization of f to the special fiber $\hat{X}$ of the family $\mathcal{X}$ (recall that $\mathbf{k}_0 = \mathbb{Q}(t)$). More precisely, if $\mathcal{L}_t$ is a (movable) linear system defining f, then its specialization $\mathcal{L}_0$ to $\hat{X}$ may acquire some divisorial components in the base locus.[1)] Subtracting all these components we arrive at a linear system which we set to define f_0.

Lemma 3.5. *f_0 is not induced by a self-map of Sing$(\hat{X})$ (for an appropriate f). In other words, if $x_0 = \ldots = x_p = 0$ are the equations of the singular locus Sing$(\hat{X}) \subset \hat{X}$, then $f \neq \mathrm{id}$ on the subspace $\mathbb{P}^p \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ complementary to Sing$(\hat{X})$.*

Proof. Let the notations be as in the proof of Lemma 3.3. One can choose a $\mathbf{k}$-point $o \in \mathcal{X}$ such that ψ (resp. ϕ) is unramified at o (resp. at $\psi(o)$).

Take $f := \phi \circ \sigma \circ \psi$ for some $\sigma \in \mathrm{Bir}(\mathbb{P}^{N-1})$ to be specified. Namely, choose σ to be defined at $\psi(o)$, and then we also assume that $f(o) = o$. Further, since ψ, ϕ induce isomorphisms of the tangent spaces $T_o = T_{\phi(\psi(o))}, T_{\psi(o)}$, and (adjoint of) σ can act transitively on the $(N-1)$-tuples of $\mathbf{k}$-vectors in $T_{\psi(o)}$ (e. g. when $\sigma \in \mathrm{PGL}(N, \mathbf{k})$), we arrive at such f whose Jacobian $\mathrm{Jac}_o(f)$ is a $\mathbf{k}$-matrix with pairwise distinct eigen values and all defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. Then, considering f_0 as a rational self-map of $\mathbb{P}^N$ (cf. the discussion at the beginning of **3.4**), we obtain that all non-zero eigen values of the matrix $\mathrm{Jac}_{o'}(f_0)$ are pairwise distinct as well. Here $o' \in \hat{X}$ is the specialization of o.[2)]

Now suppose that f_0 *is* induced by some rational endomorphism of $\mathrm{Sing}(\hat{X})$. Again we regard f_0 as a self-map of $\mathbb{P}^N$. Then f_0 is regular at some point $o' \in \mathbb{P}^N$, $f_0(o') = o'$ and the non-zero eigen values of $\mathrm{Jac}_{o'}(f_0)$ are all different. On the other hand, $f_0 = \mathrm{id}$ on the subspace $\mathbb{P}^p \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ complementary to $\mathrm{Sing}(\hat{X})$, a contradiction. □

Identify X with a (varying) section of $\hat{X}$ by $\mathbb{P}^p \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ (cf. the beginning of **3.1**). Let $f_X : X \dashrightarrow X$ be the composition of $f_0\big|_X$ and the linear projection $\hat{X} \dashrightarrow X$ from $\mathrm{Sing}(\hat{X})$.

[1)] The latter stems from the fact that f may not be defined (in codimension 2) on $\hat{X}$.

[2)] Note that o' is not contained in the indeterminacy locus of f_0 for the indicated o and σ. Thus f_0 is defined at o' and satisfies $f_0(o') = o'$.

Lemma 3.6. *$f_X \neq \mathrm{id}$ and is dominant.*

Proof. Indeed, f_0 induces a non-identical map on X by Lemma 3.5, and it remains to apply Corollary 2.5 to the $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-1})$-map f_X. □

Remark 3.7. For the last part of Lemma 3.6, observe that in the course of the proof of Lemma 3.5 it is not at all clear a priori why $f_{0*}(\hat{X}) \neq 0$, and so one needs an additional argument (results of the second half of Section 2 for instance) in order to proceed.

Theorem 1.2 (for the given X) now follows from

Proposition 3.8. $\deg f_X > 1$.

Proof. Regard $\mathcal{X}$ as a family of hypersurfaces $\mathcal{X}_t \subset \mathbb{P}^N \times t \subset \mathbb{P}^N \times \mathbb{P}^1$ (with $\mathcal{X}_0 := \hat{X}$). Let $\pi : \mathcal{X} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ be the natural projection (so that $\pi^{-1}(t) = \mathcal{X}_t$). Let also $\mathcal{L}_t$ be as in the second paragraph of **3.4**.

Lemma 3.9. *The linear system $\mathcal{L}_0$ is movable on $\hat{X}$.*

Proof. Suppose the contrary. Then the π-map $f : \mathcal{X} \dashrightarrow \mathcal{X}$ has indeterminacies on $X \subset \hat{X}$. Resolve these by some π-blow-up $\sigma : \mathcal{Y} \longrightarrow \mathcal{X}$. Let $\mathcal{Y} \xrightarrow{a} \mathcal{Z} \xrightarrow{b} \mathcal{X}$ be the Stein factorization of the resolved f. Here a, b are some π-morphisms, with a inducing a birational isomorphism between $\mathcal{Y}$ and $\mathcal{Z}$. Moreover, since f is not defined on X, the proper transform $\sigma_*^{-1}X$ of X on $\mathcal{Y}$ belongs to the exceptional locus of a. Composing further with b, this yields a rational self-map $X \dashrightarrow X$ of degree 0, in contradiction with Corollary 2.5. Hence $\mathcal{L}_0$ is movable on $\hat{X}$. □

Let $\mathcal{Y}, \sigma, a, \ldots$ be as in the proof of Lemma 3.9. It then follows from Lemma 3.9 that $\hat{X} = \mathcal{X}_0$ and the scheme $\mathcal{Z}_0 := b^{-1}(0)$ are birationally isomorphic via $a \circ \sigma^{-1}$ (recall that b is *finite*). In particular, $\mathcal{Z}_0$ is not a ramification devisor of b, which implies that $\deg b\big|_{\mathcal{Z}_t} = \deg b\big|_{\mathcal{Z}_0}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{C}$ close to 0.

Now, since $\deg b\big|_{\mathcal{Z}_t} > 1$ by construction (when $t \neq 0$ at least), we deduce that $\deg f_0 = \deg b\big|_{\mathcal{Z}_0} > 1$ as well. The latter also gives $\deg f_X > 1$. Indeed, otherwise restricting $\mathcal{L}_0$ to generic $X = \hat{X} \cap \mathbb{P}^p$, we get $f_X \in \mathbf{Aut}(X)$ according to Lemma 3.6 and [12]. But then, since f_X is composed of $f_0\big|_X$ and a linear projection, we obtain $\mathcal{L}_0 \subseteq |\mathcal{O}_X(1)|$, which obviously contradicts $\deg f_0 > 1$. The proof of Proposition 3.8 is finished. □

To complete the proof of Theorem 1.2 we simply apply Remark 2.7 and the fact that all the preceding arguments go verbatim with $\mathbb{Q}$ replaced by $\mathbb{Q}(t)$. Furthermore, in the generic setting one can replace the argument with $f_X \in \mathbf{Aut}(X)$ at the end of the proof of Proposition 3.8 by that with $f_X = \mathrm{id}$ (cf. [23, Theorem 5]), thus getting a contradiction with Lemma 3.6.[3)] Notice however that one still needs Corollary 2.5 for example in order to have Lemma 3.9 (compare with Remark 3.7).

4. Proof of Corollary 1.6

4.1. We proceed with applying the constructions of Section 3 to study the arithmetics of hypersurfaces $X_p \subset \mathbb{P}^p$ (notations are as earlier).[4)]

Let again X be as in Proposition 2.6.

Lemma 4.2. *f_X is non-periodic.*

Proof. Indeed, otherwise we have $f_X^k = \mathrm{id}$ for some k, so that both f_X, f_X^{k-1} are invertible. But this contradicts Proposition 3.8. □

Fix f_X as in Lemma 4.2. Then after possibly replacing f_X by $f_X^k, k \gg 1$, from [13] we obtain a point $o \in X(K)$ such that $f_X(o) = o$ and f_X is defined at o. We also have $\det \mathrm{Jac}_o(f_X) \neq 0$ because f_X is dominant.

Lemma 4.3. *There exists a* $\mathbf{k}$*-cube* $\square_o \subset X$ *centered at* o *and invariant under* f_X*.*

Proof. Let $\square \subset X$ be some cube containing o and defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. Then the set $\bigcup_{k>0} X \setminus f_X^k(\square)$ is not everywhere dense in X. Indeed, otherwise there would exist a subsequence $f_X^{k_i}(\square) \to o$ for $i \to \infty$, which implies that $o \in X(\mathbb{Q})$ and contradicts $n_X = p$. It remains to take f_X-invariant $\square_o \subseteq \bigcap_{k>0} f_X^k(\square)$. □

It follows from Lemma 4.3 (and the implicit function theorem) that the eigen values λ_i of the matrix $\mathrm{Jac}_o(f_X)$ are algebraic numbers (from K), all having norms $|\lambda_i| = 1$, $1 \leq i \leq p-1$. Furthermore, making if necessary a coordinate change on $\mathbb{P}^p \supset X$ of the form $x_j \mapsto \alpha_j x_j$, $0 \leq j \leq p$ (i. e. rescaling the metric on X), for some $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{Q}^*$, we may assume λ_i to be algebraic integers (from O_K).

[3)] This argument may be considered as another way to prove Theorem 1.2.

[4)] Note that one can not specialize the (abundance of) $\mathbf{k}$-points on $\mathcal{X}$ to "many" $\mathbb{Q}$-points on the cone $\hat{X}$ (as we did with (some of) endomorphisms) because $n_X = p$ and so all the points on $\hat{X}$ we obtain this way are concentrated on $\mathrm{Sing}(\hat{X})$.

Lemma 4.4. *The matrix $Jac_o(f_X)$ is semi-simple. Moreover, there is $j < p-2$ such that $\lambda_1 = \ldots = \lambda_j = \pm 1$, while $\lambda_{j+1}, \ldots, \lambda_{p-1}$ are multiplicatively independent.*

Proof. The first claim follows from the fact that f_X linearizes on $\square_o$. Now, if $\lambda_i = \pm 1$ (or equivalently $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}$) for all i, then $f_X^2 = \mathrm{id}$, a contradiction.

Further, Dirichlet's unit theorem yields $\lambda_{j+1} \ldots \lambda_{p-1} = |\lambda_{j+1} \ldots \lambda_{p-1}| = 1$, $\lambda_j = \lambda_k^{-1}$ as the only relation between $\lambda_{j+1}, \ldots, \lambda_{p-1} \in O_K^*$. In particular, since $j < p-1$, $\lambda_{j+1}, \ldots, \lambda_{p-1}$ generate a free subgroup $\subseteq \mathbb{Z}^{p-j-1} \subset O_K^*$.

Suppose that $j = p-2$. Then $\lambda_{j+1}, \ldots, \lambda_{p-1}$ are all equal to $\lambda_{j+1}^{\pm 1}$ say. On the other hand, characteristic polynomial of $\mathrm{Jac}_o(f_X)$ is defined over $\mathbf{k}$ (by construction of $\square_o$ in Lemma 4.3), and hence the minimal polynomial of λ_{j+1} divides it. All together, this implies that $\lambda_i^2 = \pm 1$ for all $i \geq j+1$, a contradiction.

Thus we get $j < p-2$ and the claim follows. □

The arguments in [1, Section 2] and Lemma 4.4 imply that Zariski closure of the f-orbit of the locus $X(K)$ has dimension $\geq p-j-1 > 1$.

Finally, to complete the proof of Corollary 1.6, similarly as at the end of Section 3 one replaces $\mathbb{Q}$ by $\mathbb{Q}(t)$ and argues as above.

References

[1] E. Amerik, F. Bogomolov and M. Rovinsky, Remarks on endomorphisms and rational points, Compos. Math. **147** (2011), no. 6, 1819–1842.

[2] E. Amerik, M. Rovinsky and A. Van de Ven, A boundedness theorem for morphisms between threefolds, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **49** (1999), no. 2, 405–415.

[3] A. Auel, J.-L. Colliot-Thélène and R. Parimala, Universal unramified cohomology of cubic fourfolds containing a plane, Preprint arXiv:1310.6705.

[4] A. Beauville, Endomorphisms of hypersurfaces and other manifolds, Internat. Math. Res. Notices **2001**, no. 1, 53–58.

[5] B. J. Birch, Forms in many variables, Proc. Roy. Soc. Ser. A **265** (1961/1962), 245–263.

[6] I. A. Cheltsov, Mat. Zametki **68** (2000), no. 1, 131 – 138; translation in Math. Notes **68** (2000), no. 1-2, 113 – 119.

[7] I. A. Cheltsov, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk **60** (2005), no. 5(365), 71–160; translation in Russian Math. Surveys **60** (2005), no. 5, 875–965.

[8] I. Cheltsov and I. Karzhemanov, Halphen pencils on quartic threefolds, Adv. Math. **223** (2010), no. 2, 594 – 618.

[9] X. Chen, Self rational maps of K3 surfaces, Preprint arXiv:1008.1619, 2010.

[10] J.-L. Colliot-Thélène, Fields of cohomological dimension 1 versus C_1-fields, in *Algebra and number theory*, 1–6, Hindustan Book Agency, Delhi.

[11] A. Corti, Singularities of linear systems and 3-fold birational geometry, in *Explicit birational geometry of 3-folds*, 259–312, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., 281, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge.

[12] T. de Fernex, Birationally rigid hypersurfaces, Invent. Math. **192** (2013), no. 3, 533–566.

[13] N. Fakhruddin, Questions on self maps of algebraic varieties, J. Ramanujan Math. Soc. **18** (2003), no. 2, 109–122.

[14] J. Harris, B. Mazur and R. Pandharipande, Hypersurfaces of low degree, Duke Math. J. **95** (1998), no. 1, 125–160.

[15] J. Harris and Y. Tschinkel, Rational points on quartics, Duke Math. J. **104** (2000), no. 3, 477–500.

[16] O. Haution, Degree formula for the Euler characteristic, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **141** (2013), no. 6, 1863–1869.

[17] V. A. Iskovskikh, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk **56** (2001), no. 2(338), 3–86; translation in Russian Math. Surveys **56** (2001), no. 2, 207–291.

[18] V. A. Iskovskih and Yu. I. Manin, Three-dimensional quartics and counterexamples to the Lüroth problem, Mat. Sb. (N.S.) **86(128)** (1971), 140 – 166.

[19] V. A. Iskovskikh and A. V. Pukhlikov, Birational automorphisms of multidimensional algebraic manifolds, J. Math. Sci. **82** (1996), no. 4, 3528–3613.

[20] J. Kollár, Tr. Mat. Inst. Steklova **264** (2009), Mnogomernaya Algebraicheskaya Geometriya, 103–108; translation in Proc. Steklov Inst. Math. **264** (2009), no. 1, 96–101.

[21] J. Kollár, Esnault-Levine-Wittenberg indices, Preprint arXiv:1312.3923.

[22] J. Kollár et al., Flips and abundance for algebraic threefolds, vol. 211, Astértisque, 1992.

[23] H. Matsumura and P. Monsky, On the automorphisms of hypersurfaces, J. Math. Kyoto Univ. **3** (1963/1964), 347–361.

[24] A. Merkurjev, Algebraic oriented cohomology theories, in *Algebraic number theory and algebraic geometry*, 171–193, Contemp. Math., 300, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI.

[25] K. H. Paranjape and V. Srinivas, Self-maps of homogeneous spaces, Invent. Math. **98** (1989), no. 2, 425–444.

[26] A. V. Pukhlikov, Birational automorphisms of Fano hypersurfaces, Invent. Math. **134** (1998), no. 2, 401–426.

[27] C. Voisin, Unirational threefolds with no universal codimension 2 cycle, Preprint arXiv:1312.2122.

[28] K. Zainoulline, Degree formula for connective K-theory, Invent. Math. **179** (2010), no. 3, 507–522.

Kavli IPMU (WPI), The University of Tokyo, 5-1-5 Kashiwanoha, Kashiwa, 277-8583, Japan
E-mail address: ilya.karzhemanov@ipmu.jp